DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 402 552 CS 012 663

AUTHOR Block, Cathy Collins; Gasser, Judy
TITLE Promoting Teacher Change To Enhance Comprehension for At-Risk Students.
PUB DATE 5 Dec 96
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (46th, Charleston, SC, November 29-December 2, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *High Risk Students; *Inservice Teacher Education; Reading Achievement; *Reading Comprehension; Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *Strategic Reading; Teaching Research

ABSTRACT

A study examined shifts that occur in teachers' behaviors and teaching repertoires as they become more strategic teachers, and the types of instruction that lead to the greatest growth in at-risk students' comprehension and reading abilities. A literacy initiative coordinator and a college researcher worked collaboratively with nine teachers to incorporate strategy instruction into a district-wide, third-fifth grade reading program. The 316 students in the program functioned in the lowest 10% of literacy abilities. Data included teacher interviews, field notes, running records, writing samples, and other student performance indicators. Results indicated that (1) teacher attendance at inservice training sessions and reading materials prior to training session correlated with higher student achievement; (2) opportunity to plan what they needed to learn was the second highest correlate to students' success, with teachers demonstrating use of strategic instruction being the highest correlate to the amount of literacy growth created for students; (3) ability of teachers to write their philosophies of instruction did not correlate to their abilities to create literacy achievement for their students; and (4) students significantly increased in several areas of strategic reading and on standardized test scores. Findings suggest that teacher change cannot be measured through one preconceived measure or index of change; teachers profited from a collaborative mode of dialogue consisting of at least 3 perspectives; and some teachers do not necessarily improve over time. (Contains 16 references and 3 tables of data; appendixes provide a list of things a teacher was going to try, a teacher's essay on her instructional philosophy, and 2 survey instruments.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 402 552

Promoting Teacher Change to Enhance Comprehension for At-Risk Students

Dr. Cathy Collins Block
Professor of Education
Texas Christian University
2800 S. University Drive
310B Bailey Building
Fort Worth, TX 76129
(817) 921-7660

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C Block

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Dr. Judy Gasser
Literacy Initiative Coordinator
Grand Prairie Independent School District
330 N. E. 27th Street
Grand Prairie, TX 75050
(214) 237-4014

CS012663

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Charleston, SC, December 5, 1996

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Promoting Teacher Change to Enhance Comprehension for At-Risk Students From the Inside Out

Throughout the past several years, literacy researchers and teachers have voiced concern that at-risk students do not read strategically or initiate alternative methods of making meaning when confused (Allington, 1996; Block, 1997). A difficulty in addressing this condition is that many practicing teachers have not learned to build at-risk students' abilities to use higher-level comprehension strategies. It seems reasonable to assume that if most practicing teachers are to gain this knowledge school districts must provide the training and support. To most effectively understand and employ strategy instruction, teachers have requested such professional development supports as sample lessons, in-class modeling, peer coaching, and brainstorming with peers (Brown, El-Dinary, Pressley, Coy-Ogan, 1995). In this study, we provided these types of support to teachers who had never taught strategies to at-risk students. Teachers in this study also played an active role in planning the type of support they would receive. The major hypothesis was to examine what teachers need to learn how to teach comprehension strategies to at-risk students. What would help these teachers make a transition away from more tradition methods of teaching that had not increased the achievement of students who were functioning below their peers in literacy?

A second concern was to examine if at-risk students, who are significantly below their grade placement in reading ability, can significantly increase their comprehension abilities if they are taught higher level comprehension strategies. All students in this study were still having difficulty decoding at grade level. Would they profit from comprehension strategy instruction when they were allocating so much of their attention to identifying single word meanings? When at-risk students are taught at their instrucitonal level, would this allow them to reach higher levels of comprehension when strategies are provided? The ultimate goal is to develop a model of teacher change that best assists teachers to increase at-risk students affective and cognitive responses to reading and writing.

Research has documented that teachers experience difficulties as they move from a transmission teacher to a strategic teacher (Watson & Young, 1986; Scharer, 1996; and Wollman-Bonilla, 1994). Researchers have attempted to assist in this change process in several ways: implementing interventions in their classrooms that model new teaching methodologies (Alvermann and Hayes, 1989); reading response groups about the books they are reading as models for ways in which strategies and literacy can be discussed in their rooms (Micklos, 1992; Scharer, 1996), and collaborative inquiry models in which supervisors and teachers set collective goals, dialogue about teacher change, and create high mutually determined performance expectations for both faculty and administration (Marshall and Hatcher, 1996). These training supports follow the Vygotskian theory that adults progressively internalize teaching behaviors though others demonstrations of self-regulated actions until these behaviors become internally automated or "fossilized" (Vygotsky, 1978).

A second premise upon which our work was based was that people learn through continuous feedback from their environment. In this study, teachers received support from a team of teachers, administrators, and researchers through intensive instructional supervision and mentoring for two years. These supports included (1) dialogues in which teacher met regularly to

discuss issues, dilemmas, and uncertainties inherent in the teaching of strategies; (2) sharing of new ideas and self-discoveries as they searched for a deeper, more integrated understanding of how to increase the strategic reading abilities of at-risk students; (3) teacher planning of what they needed to become more effective teachers; (4) scripted lessons; (5) expert modeling by researcher and colleagues; (6) inservice training sessions; (7) attendance at a state literacy meeting; and (8) individual teacher observations/counseling as they taught strategies. The research questions that guided this study were: What shifts occur in teacher behaviors and their teaching repertories as they become more strategic teachers? What types of instruction lead to greatest growth in at-risk students' comprehension and reading abilities?

Method

In this study the Literacy Initiative Coordinator and a college researcher worked collaboratively with nine teachers (who had from zero to twenty-three years of previous teaching experience) to incorporate strategy instruction into a district-wide, third-fifth grade reading program. The 316 students involved in this program were selected by several measures of literacy and were functioning in the lowest 10% of literacy abilities in the school population..

This study involved the opportunities for teachers to select a wide variety of training supports. A combination of data sources examined the value of these opportunities in creating increased student achievement. Teachers were afforded the opportunity to: (1) attend inservice training meetings, (2) plan what they needed to learn, (3) volunteer to be observed in their strategy instruction lessons, (4) become mentors to their colleagues and first-year teachers who entered the study in the second year, (5) teachers' written essays concerning their teaching philosophies, and (6) present at a regional International Reading Association annual meeting. We also collected data from three to four intensive observations of each teacher's classroom instruction, interviews, student literacy measures on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, principal and teacher surveys, and training meeting minutes. The district administrator and the literacy researcher analyzed these data to document the influence of each upon individual teacher's change, and slow-progress students' literacy achievement.

In December 1995, the school district provided funds for students who were reading far below grade level and who, without stronger instructional support would fall further and further behind. In response to this concern, principals, teachers and members of the Department of Instruction gathered data on up to 100 students per school who were struggling. During the first year, 35 intermediate students in each of the nine buildings were served; in year two, 40 students in every elementary school were served with teachers assuming a seventh period of instruction. The cut-off in the first year was for students who were falling between a year to a year and a half below grade level. During the second year, the mean dropped to a year and a half to two years below grade level. Students who qualified for special education, regular education, bilingual and ESL students were also included in this study.

Through a job interview, the nine teachers in this study were chosen based on their commitment to developing literacy for at-risk students and their level of prior training. During these initial interviews, teachers were told that they would be joining a school-district, university collaborative training program in which research data would be collected. The teachers met for one full week prior to commencing instruction, and approximately once a month throughout the two-year project. At every meeting they also had opportunities to share their successes with other

teachers in this group. They were also encouraged to share with others in their buildings, and at state and regional conferences. They watched a university professor model higher level thinking strategies with at-risk students that they selected, were provided lessons and materials to use, and served as mentors to teachers who entered the program after its first year.

In January, teachers began four intensive days of training with the district's Reading Facilitator and university researcher. Teachers read many research studies prior to the meetings and agreed that the following would be essential qualities in the instruction they would deliver: (a) sustained reading and writing of high quality materials; (b) instruction must be at the student's instructional level; (c) comprehension instruction would not be just questions and answers but the use of appropriate strategies to unlock meaning; (d) strategic thinking would be demonstrated through teacher and student talk and with "think alouds."; (e) rereading of familiar texts would help build fluency; (f) every instructional moment had to be used to expand, personalize, and intensify teaching and learning; (g) acceleration, which is critical to struggling readers, could only occur when teacher have made proper assessment of student needs and teach at the appropriate point where instruction is needed; (h) it is important for teachers to listen to students and provide an equal amount of student talk to teacher talk; (i) teachers need to watch for students' monitoring of their reading for errors and transferring strategies to new reading situations; (j) and, it is critical that these reading instructional strategies be congruent with the students' regular classroom instruction.

Based on these foundational points, a framework for each strategy lesson was developed by the teachers which included a daily guided reading lesson, comprehension strategy instruction, word sort activities, and students' reading response activities. Even though these commonalities were seen in each lesson, variation also occurred between lessons in order to meet student needs, teachers' areas of expertise, and unique site-based requirements. For example, during the second year, teachers used computers in a wide variety of ways to enhance instruction, including the development of students' vocabulary, publishing students' writings, and creating class-books on interactive disks with music in the background.

Once these guidelines were created by the teachers, the school district administrator continued to provide reports of research to the teachers, facilitated teachers' dialogue about challenges and successes, encouraged teacher sharing, planned for teachers to attend the state reading association meeting, wrote a proposal for teachers to present their work at the Southwest IRA Regional Conference, and conducted one-on-one interviews, consultations and observations with each teacher. The university researchers modeled strategy lessons, conducted one-to-one interviews, consulted with teachers, collected and analyzed research data, and observed teachers as they taught. Notes from these dialogues and meetings, as well as teachers' essays about their teaching philosophies were analyzed as part of the data base for this study. The district administrator and university researcher also obtained copies of teachers' self- initiated transfers and extensions of what they had learned, and/or wanted to share with colleagues.

During each training session, field notes were taken, and on two occasions they were videotaped/audiotapes and transcribed. Teachers were interviewed before and after each round of observations by the researchers. Teachers also completed running records at least once a month, with three teachers doing so every week. They also collected comprehension checks, retellings, writing samples, and other performance indicators. Teachers saw every student in the study for

30-45 minutes daily.

Data Treatment

Data was transcribed as described by Bogdan and Biklen (1982). As data was read, two questions were in mind: (a) What does this data suggest about how and in what directions teachers are advancing in their ability to teach strategically?; and (b) What evidence do we have that these changes are reflected in students' increased reading abilities?

The administrator-researcher team used the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to analyze the observation data. The constant comparative process involved transcribing data, printing out transcripts, and repeatedly discussing the observations of individual teachers. Guided by the research questions, this team searched the data for patterns of events, actions, results, and beliefs. Analyses were ongoing with new data compared and contrasted to emerging patterns. Emerging patterns were constantly modified to accommodate new patterns induced from the data until no new categories emerged.

Documents made during training sessions as well as teacher artifacts made were also analyzed using a document analysis strategy (Hodder, 1994). We analyzed the pre and post interviews with a within- and cross-case analysis strategy (e.g., Patton, 1990) These findings were used to triangulate observational data. The final analysis consisted of constructing assertions, supported by patterns in data, general frequency data, and specific descriptive information (Erickson, 1986).

RESULTS

Several types of training support did not correlate with highest student achievement. First, after four months of training, teachers were asked to volunteer to be observed in their instruction of strategy lessons. The hypothesis was that teachers who were most effective in their strategy lessons would be the most likely to volunteer. Data revealed that our hypothesis was incorrect. While the teacher who created most highest achievement gains for her students had to be coaxed into volunteering; the teacher who had second highest gains did volunteer; the teacher with third highest never agreed to be observed, and the first to volunteer were the fourth and seventh of eight in effectiveness ratings. There was no correlation to confidence level in being observed and level of ability to create achievement gains through their instruction. Similarly, the amount of oral participation during the training session did not correlate with highest student achievement. If teachers attended the inservice training sessions and had read the material prior to the training session, their participation did correlate to high achievement. However, as the two teachers who either missed training sessions or did not read materials to prepare for training were the only teachers who had students who actually decreased in their literacy abilities as a result of this study, as shown in Table 1-1.

The opportunity to plan what they needed to learn was the second highest correlate to student success, with teachers demonstrated use of strategic instruction being the highest correlate to the amount of literacy growth created for students, as shown in Table 1-2. The inclination to participate in small group discussions about their personal insights and to bring artifacts to share was not a significant predictor, however. Teachers who shared the most artifacts were third and fourth, respectively, in their abilities to create literacy growth for students. Similarly, teachers with the most incidents of talk during training sessions were ranked fourth,

seventh, fifth, third, and sixth, respectively, in their abilities to create growth in their students' literacy.

To analyze the pace and depth of teacher growth in their strategic teaching abilities, in the fourth month of the study teachers completed "The Reflection on Research Based Practices" survey, as shown in Appendix B-2. This fourteen-question survey was a self-assessment of their progress on the fourteen goals of their program that they had established at the beginning of the study. Teachers ranked the master of strategy instruction as 6th of the 14th in their level of achieved competence. Most highly ranked was their abilities to "rereading familiar text to help build fluency and instruction must be at the student's instructional level which can be measured by running records and careful teacher observations." but the difference in competence rating was insignificant, less than one point on the rating scale. Thus, all teachers felt that they were good if not very good strategy teachers, and teachers felt they employed all nine of the elements of effective instruction that they had identified at the beginning of the study. The mean rankings teachers gave themselves and the ranking they gave for their abilities to teach comprehension abilities did not correlate significantly to the amount of achievement gain their students experienced under their direction.

The results of the "Reflection on Research-based Practices" indicated that all teachers ranked themselves at least 3 on a scale of 6 on 12 of the fourteen items. Only on the items of "The intervention I am providing is congruent with the student's classroom instruction" and "Make sure that the teacher is not so busy teaching that this activity is interfering with students' learning" did one or more of the teacher rank themselves as below average. The highest mean on all fourteen items was 5.5 on the six point scale and the lowest was 3.5 on the six point scale.

At the end of one year in the program, every teacher wrote essays to describe their philosophies of instruction, as shown in Appendix B-1. These essays demonstrated each teacher's degree of growth in strategic teaching. After reading each essay, the district administrator and university researcher rank ordered teachers according to their ability to articulate their changes toward becoming more strategic. The rankings were identical except for teachers numbered 5 and 6 were reversed by the two raters. This discrepancy was resolved through discussions and the remaining data was analyzed according to this agreed upon ordering of the speed and quality of change within the group of nine teachers. The ability of teachers to write their philosophies of instruction did not correlate to their abilities to create literacy achievement for their students. Specifically, while three of the most able teachers were also among the top three teachers in writing about their teaching philosophies, four teachers showed no correlation between their abilities to express their teaching philosophies in writing and their abilities to move students to higher levels of literacy achievement. On the lowest end, the lowest ranked teacher did have the least strategyuy-based concept of teaching.

Similarly, after nine months into the program, eight principals completed a data evaluation survey of the program. The mode of 5 principals ranking was the highest possible; 5. One principal ranked the program as O. K. And two ranked the program as 4.0 or good. The principals mentioned the excellent questions and higher order responses, as well as the strategies used to prompt, cue and use context clues as the most important growths that increased their students' comprehension. Strategies were used to actively involve students in discussion and integration of other content areas. The confidence level of the students increased. They feel more comfortable in

reading. The characteristics that impressed the principal was that students' level of engagement and use of different improved their comprehension and willingness to try, e.g.: "I saw students giving opinions on stories they had read. These opinions used higher order skills and did not rely on just facts."

Finally, at the beginning of the second year, every teacher was asked what they were going to try in the coming year (see Appendix A). Notice that all higher achieving teachers wanted to expand their competencies in more than one way of delivering higher level thinking.

DISCUSSION

Question I: The major hypothesis was to examine what teachers need to learn to teach comprehension strategies to at-risk students. What would help these teachers make a transition away from the more tradition methods of teaching that had not increased the achievement of students who were functioning below their peers in literacy? To discuss this question, data from all indices were collapsed for each teacher in the study. These data follow.

Teacher 1 created the most growth in student literacy. She was reluctant to volunteer to be observed the first year, but was encouraged to do so by the school district administrator. She was completing her master's degree and felt she wouldn't have the time to prepare adequately for the strategy lesson to be successful. After a positive evaluation of this first teaching experience, this teacher agreed to be observed a second time, to teach a model lesson for colleagues and first year teachers in the study, and to teach a sample lesson on a videotape being made by the state education agency. This teacher commenced a lesson after a summer vacation with a reminder of the strategies that students had learned the previous year. The students generated these strategies from memory and from posters around the room.

She began lessons by giving students time to picture in their minds what they thought the story would be about, told purpose for learning the strategy (e.g., "Good readers predict on their own so today I am going to ask you to tell me where you are predicting as we read, and I also want you to tell me why this was a good place to predict." She also taught her students to monitor their own comprehension by performing frequent, spontaneous think alouds such as "I don't quite understand here...Let me see..." Then se would reread and thing aloud. She would also ask: "How are you checking to see that you are staying involved?". Duirng each sessions she also had students reading silently and independently as she talked with each one about what strategies they are using.

She had taught for eight years prior to the study. Teacher 1 rarely shared during group discussions but did so on a one-to-one basis with the district administrator and university researcher. She talks frequently with classroom teachers, the district administrator, and with parents to build success for all 45 of her students. On the posttest, Teacher 1 performed 32 actions that distinguish quality strategy instruction as listed in Table 1-3. She also had 18 incidents of quality strategy instruction on the pretest, 16 actions that demonstrate instructional quality on the posttest, 0 actions to reduce students' transfer of strategies, and created a videotaped lesson for state distribution by the state education agency

Teacher 2 created the second highest growth in student literacy, volunteered to model for colleagues and new teachers, created record-keeping system for the entire group, organized the material according to the district-wide TAAS objectives, was the first to incorporate the computer into her instructional program, began her master's degree, and had no years of teaching

experience. She volunteered to be observed twice by the university researcher, and on her post-test demonstrated 31 actions that distinguish quality strategy instruction as listed in Table 1-3. These included having high student expectations, pointed out students' explicit use of strategies (e.g. "I liked how you went back to fix it when you aren't quite sure and that's a great strategy"); complimented students on self-initiated strategy use; called strategies by name; taught more than one strategy at a time; provided multiple expanded directions and examples prior to students' independent application of the strategy; tied introduction of strategy to students' lives; asked students to explain how they used the strategy; extended wait time; reviewed strategy as a summary at the close of the lesson; prompted students' transfer of strategy to life, e.g. "how can you use this strategy in your class today?"; strategy was retaught for students who could not give an example; reduced the difficulty of the strategy by applying it to a story they had read as an illustration of the strategy's use by literary characters; and, prompted students about the strategy that would be learned the next day and told how this strategy would build upon today's lesson to expand their reading abilities. Her ebb and flow of student initiation and teacher direction gently sustained student continuous engagement. Teacher 2 also performed 13 actions to demonstrate quality strategy instruciton on the pretest, 0 actions to reduce student transfer, and performed 13 actions for quality instruction on the posttest, as also shown in Table 1-2.

Teacher 3 was the first to share orally at most training sessions including the sharing of student samples of work on strategies that she had already completed. She also shared 10 times more frequently than Teacher 1 and two and one-half times as frequently as Teacher 2. She made more oral contributions during training sessions that five other teachers combined. She made the most contributions on the average of all teachers. She had 18 years of teaching experience. She did not volunteer to be observed during the first or second year. The first year she felt that she wasn't doing a good enough job and in the second year she canceled the day before her observation was to occur. Her sister had been in the hospital for several months and she was contemplating retirement. This teacher was among the first to display strategy sheets on posters in her classroom, and she was the best teacher in her abilities to express her teaching philosophy in writing.

Teacher 4 performed 3 actions that distinguish quality strategy instruction on the posttest, i.e. she called strategies by name, demonstrated how to use more than one strategy at a time, and used strategy posters which were displayed in the room. Unfortunately, on the posttest, this teacher also performed 3 actions that reduced student transfer of strategy use, i.e. she did not require students to say the reasons behind their selection of a strategy's use, did not call for every student to give an example of strategy's use during direct instruction, and did not require every student to participate. In the pretest observation she had 7 incidents of quality teaching and 19 on the post-test.Teacher 4 volunteered to be observed by the university researcher during the first year of the study. She was the second member of the group to bring copies of activities to share with the remainder of the group, but unlike Teacher 2 this teacher's contributions did not relate to strategy instruction but rather championed skill-based activities. Over the summer between the two years of the study, she wrote a five page article concerning the study which she submitted for publication, which is one of the sample teacher-created artifacts in Appendix B-1. She displayed strategy thinking guides in her room. On the pretest she only had 1 action that distinguishes quality strategy instruction, and on the posttest she had 8 actions that demonstrate instructional

quality. This teacher also ranked lowest in her abilities to express her teaching philosophy in writing.

Teacher 5 performed 6 actions that distinguish quality strategy instruction on the posttest, e.g. she had high student expectations; tied the introduction of the lesson and of strategies to students' lives; required every student to give an example of strategy's use; reviewed strategy at end of lesson; and, asked for examples of students' use of strategies at home. Unfortunately, on the posttest Teacher 5 also performed 1 incident to reduce student transfer--spent more time talking about strategy in introductory section of lesson and this explanation was not connected to the story to be read. This teacher performed 9 incidents of quality instruction on the pretest observation and 20 incidents on the posttest observation. Teacher 5 was also the first to display the strategy thinking guides in her room. She also was the first to integrate strategies across the content areas. She was also the first to seek her own materials to teach the strategies more intensely. She agreed to be observed by the university research both years. She had 17 years teaching experience, and was the fourth in ability to express her teaching philosophy in writing.

Teacher 6 performed 5 actions that distinguish quality strategy instruction on the posttest, e.g. she displayed strategy sheets and clue cards on the wall; called strategies by name; taught more than one strategy at a time; asked every student to give an example; and had high expectations. Unfortunately, on the postest this teacher also performed 1 action that reduced student transfer, i.e. she did not have adequate wait time. She did not volunteer to be observed on the pretest; had 18 indices of quality instruction on the posttest. Teacher 6 said she wanted to be observed by the university professor during her first year but that her room was not large enough for another person. On the second year, she did have the university professor to observe and stimulated other teachers and her principal to want a modeling by the university professor for every fifth grade teacher. She was the first to use the computer for vocabulary enrichment and she had 10 years of previous teaching experience. She was the fifth in ability to express her teaching philosophy in writing.

Teacher 7 performed 2 actions that distinguish quality strategy instruction, i.e. she asked students why they selected and used a strategy at a particular time; and, she tied the strategy introduction to their lives. Unfortunately, on the posttest she also performed 5 actions that reduced student transfer of strategy use, e.g. she allowed students' misinterpretation to go uncorrected; did not require students to read during the lesson; spent the full class period talking about topics and strategies without calling them by name or connecting them to the story to be read; built background for story to be read without reading or referring to the story or its vocabularyl; and did not communicate high expectations as students who did and did not do the assignment or who did or did not bring their supplies to class received no responses for participation or non-participation . On the pretest observation this teacher performed 15 incidents of quality instruction and on post-test demonstrated 10. Teacher 7 was very vocal during teacher training sessions, but most of the exchanges concerned the desire to include in this program a particular curriculum that she had used before. While she talked about this program frequently, she never brought student samples or offered to make copies of this program for her colleagues. She volunteered to have the university professor come to observe her during the first year of the study, agreed to model a lesson for her colleagues and first-year teachers but when others came to observe she did not teach the strategy lesson that she had agreed to teach; and, she did not teach

the agreed upon lesson format as agreed to by the group. She read the Bible during training sessions, did not read the research studies to have been read prior to the meetings, and was completing her Master's Degree at the time of the study. She had two years of prior teaching experience. She was the second most frequently contributing member to oral discussions during training sessions, surpassed only by teacher 3.

Teacher 8 performed 4 actions that distinguish quality strategy instruction, e.g. she tied the introduction of the strategy to their lives; set purpose for using the thinking guide; asked students' why they had selected to use the strategy they did; and tied the strategy to the students' lives at home by asking them to take the thinking guide home to solve the mystery with their parents' aid. Unfortunately, on the posttest this teacher also performed 2 actions that reduced student transfer of strategy instruction, i.e., spent all the time in instruction talking about the strategy and did not tie it to examples of use during the reading of the story; and she did not teach the strategy in its entirety or model its application before asking students to apply it. This teacher did not volunteer to have a pretest observation and had 15 indices of quality instruction on posttest. Teacher 8 did not participate very much in group training sessions. She also told the university researcher that she was scared for her to come to observe, and she did not volunteer to be observed during her first year. She was pleased with the results of the second year's observation and asked for the university researcher to come again soon.

Teacher 9 dropped out of the study due to personal illness.

The following vignettes illustrate specific examples of the three findings of this study: March 29, after two months of training: (Teacher 3): "Actually I have two, I brought sheets for everybody. One is using the setting characters--problem/solution. It helps with their comprehension. That has really helped mine with their comprehension because they write it down. I haven't used this sheet with them. I was having them do it on notebook paper, but this will be quicker because its just right in front of them. The other one is vocabulary development. One thing that I've done for that is to cut up the letters of the word and put it on plastic eggs and they have to put it in order and ten talk about the meaning."

March 29, (Teacher 1): "I do the same thing as Freda. As I watch my readers, it seems like one reason their comprehension is poor because their mind is not active, they're calling words. It seems like the more I can get them involved before we read the book, the more active their minds are. So, [when I use] the KWL, and the Rigby books, the focus ideas that they give like on my chart, "In the clouds" are: What type of book is this? [it's fantasy]; What type of book would this be? [It is was a realistic plot]; What would you expect to find in the story? [it was factual]; What would you expect to find? Then, they would make their predictions and they're more involved. I like the idea of keeping their minds active while they're reading."

March 29--(Teacher 2): "What did I do to help my kids get started? I gave an example of each pattern so my name went up first. I said this book had patterns and then they get the feel of it. I used your patterns and I think after our least session Jeanine shared with us how her kids got into it. I was like Freda at first. I thought this was going to be a difficult session to teach at first, but it wasn't. They picked up on it and knew every book, they tell me the pattern of every book. With every book, I use the literacy strategy chart. It's about eight types of patterns and I base my patterns on the book. They just feel good at it. it is great!! They learn from it. I tell each class,

'Gosh, you're the first class that thought of this. You recognized it. When they get started, its great!!'"

Samples of the artifacts created by teachers are shown in Appendix B-l.

Question 2: Can students who are at least one-year below grade level and who must attend to decoding instruction benefit from strategy instruction? Data from the first to the last observation and standardized test records from the 316 students involved in the first year of this study evidenced that students significantly increased in the following areas and on standardized test scores as shown in Table 1-3. Prior to this study all of students failed Texas Assessment of Academic Skills. They also scored below the 30 percentile on the Iowa Texas of Basic Skills. Such instruction created most gain for third graders, then fourth graders, then fifth graders. These increases, as identified in data from this study

a significant increase in self-corrections, more fluency in reading and self-initiated use of word attack skills

students willingness to ask questions about reading and to take risks in building answers to questions during strategy instruction

more student participation in group discussions of materials read

increase use of strategies when they do not comprehend

evidence of more reading at home and school via parent and teacher survey

more student displays of self-confidence in their abilities to make meaning

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

An important finding is that we cannot measure teacher change through one preconceived measure or index of change. Teachers change in different directions and at different speeds. Similarly, assigning mentors is not as simple as it seems as some mentors are less competent than mentees. An equally important finding was that pull out programs without subsequent teacher change, training supports, and training in comprehension strategies will not result in as significant student growth for at-risk students.

For teachers who did not change, a consistent observation occurred. While these teachers could observe the child's literacy behaviors and weaknesses, and talk about strategy instruction, they did not know had to put these two bodies of knowledge together to eliminate students' literacy difficulties. These teachers could not interpret what their new instructional knowledge meant about the child, and they did not integrate their multiple sources of knowledge as they made instructional decisions. Their prior "fossilized" knowledge had not altered because these teachers were not willing or able to engage their pedagogical reasoning. The assimilation of new knowledge and training about the child and how children learn to read did not enhance their decision-making. While some could imitate behaviors that had been modeled when asked to do so, they did not initiate appropriate actions when new situations in instruction emerged. The processes of strategic teaching must encompass a conscious desire and knowledge of what the child's surface reading behaviors imply about the child's underlying cognitive processes as well as what can occur in an instructional episode to enhance or develop these processes. The translation must take place in teachers' thinking. Then they must be made concrete in their future

instructional plans, interactions with the child, and selection of the next text and strategy to teach. It also appears that because the desire to reason pedagogically must be present, intensive and constant training must be present for at least one full year before strategies can be learned by teachers and for significant changes in literacy abilities to occur for at-risk students.

Another conclusion was drawn from the reflective comments of teachers in this study. These revealed the teacher's evaluations of her teaching abilities, and reasons as to why change was or was not difficult. None wanted to change to please the administration and researcher. When life outside the classroom became cumbersome, however, attending to the level of intense reasoning necesssary in strategy instruction takes lower precedence. Teachers did not want to risk lowering their self-esteem in facing peers or supervisors when they had not invested themselves into such professional reasoning experiences. Thus, to save face, they tended to cling even firmer to prior "fossilized" knowledge bases and invested even less time in learning and changing. Most of our teachers also needed opportunities to exchange ideas and be involved in dialogues of different kinds because these dialogues provide the foundation of change. Need for such support was also found in the work of Kauffman, Short, Crawford, Kahn and Kaser (1996) as they explored teachers' development in directing reading response groups. Teachers profited from a collaborative mode of dialogue in which they heard dialogues about strategies from at least three perspectives: colleagues, students, administrators, and university researchers who developed the curriculum. Through hearing at least three diverse perspectives, teachers analyzed similarities between these interpretations and discovered what they **might** do. Strategy instruction moved beyond a rigid, scripted curriculum and highly successful teachers translated data in their personalized and individualized manners to meet their students' needs. The use of intense dialogue that involves three or more perspectives is also an opportunities means of providing the multiple supports in teacher training that is often necessary before many can engage productive pedagogical reasoning. Similarly, the longevity of the support enabled teachers to challenge themselves to consider new possibilities.

Another distinguishing characteristic is that some teachers do not necessarily get better over time. Teachers who did not engage their students' strategic reading were resistant to being observed. The deeper understanding of what it means to increase students' abilities through their own teaching actions was not as frequently experienced. Some found reasons not to try again. Some inserted stronger classroom management techniques and allowed student non-engaged compliance to replace higher levels of student engagement during instruciton. When questioned, those with the least inclination to change offered several types of self-defense. Most instantly created a straw-man to explain why their students had not improved as much as students taught by peers, i.e., they blaming their lack of effectiveness on self-perceived personality clashes with supervisory personnel. A second rationale they create is that whenever an action for improvment was suggested by peers, the district administrator, or the university researchers, these teachers immediately retorted that " they were already doing [what was suggested]". Similarly, teachers who were less rapid to incorporate strategy instruction into their lessons exhibited one or more of the following behaviors or actions.

1. They did not listen well regardless of whether the feedback concerning their teaching was positive or negative.

2. They responded to favorable or unfavorable analysis of their instructional repertoire

with the same response.. They continued to profess the virtues of the philosophy they possessed prior to training.

3. They found reasons not to be observed, and/or canceled their observation at the last minute.

4. When provided with suggestions for additions to their instructional repertoire made statements such as "I'm already doing that. I know I do it differently than everyone else but I'm confident in what I'm doing".

5. They reverted to the assumption that being a mother-figure to students was more important than, and incongruous with maintainin the intense, high-expectation laid environment created through strategy instruction. Statements were made such as: "The students are so sad and need so much mothering. My heart reaches out to them. I have to be there for them. They need a mother."

6. They were the only teachers to ask how they were doing in comparisons to others. They didn't want to be the worse teacher in the group. While they would make statements that they felt that they knew less and were doing less well than other teachers, they wanted observers to convince them that these feelings and impressions were inaccurate. They wanted the university researchers, peers, and district administrator to lower their expectations of them just as they had done for their students.

An interesting f\phenonmenon of this study was that every teacher except one was either new to the district or was changed to work in a school within the district in which she had never worked before. The teacher would did not change buildings was in a wide band of confort zone. Her teaching behaviors changd the least and the students' reading achievement was the least as well.

Alternatively, teachers who were changing in a positive direction asking more questions at each consequetive training and observation session. They saw how their changes in instruction and the addition of strategy instruction had increased their students' reading abilities and they wanted to continue to improve. The more they grew the more thirsty they became for new knowledge, e.g. teacher 4 had six specific questions prepared in advance of her posstest that she wanted to ask the university researcher. These teachers' questions and comments became highly individualized and their ideas for improvement were innovative. It appears that "once they broke the code", strategy instruction became a new field of discovery to which they could turn in confidence to gain new ideas that were guaranteed to improve their students' instruction. It appeared that once these teacher witnessed their own abilities to teach strategically, they still need the multiple supports in this study, however. They needed a safe forum for verbalizing and asking questions about their assumptions and hypotheses about their own teaching. These teachers also knew significantly more specific areas in which they wanted to improve in the second year of the study (See Appendix A).

In conclusion, it appears that researchers and school district personnel must provide intensive, multiple supports to teachers, and provide more than one way for these teachers to demonstrate the changes, growth, rate, depth and breadth of their abilities to teach strategies. In addition, providing special programs to at-risk students will result in increased achievement when their teachers provide strategy instruction consistently and abundantly in lessons, receive support

in intense training sessions, are afforded opportunities to plan what they need to learn, and are provided with a rich, research-based training to establish their own quality indicators of instructional features in the lessons they will deliver. Being able to become a mentor to someone else, talking a lot about their own lessons during training sessions, and being the first to volunteer to be observed while teaching do not appear to produce the greatest and most consistent growth in teachers' abilities to teach strategically or to establish largest achievement gains in literacy for their students.

References

Bakhtin, M. (L973). Marxism and the philosophy of language. New York: Seminar Press.

Block, C. C. (1997). Teaching the Language Arts, Second Edition. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Block, C. C. (1995). Reason to Read: Thinking Strategies for Life Through Literature, Volume 1. Palo Alto, CA: Addison Wesley.

Block, C. C. , & Mangieri, J. N. (1996a). Reason to Read: Thinking Strategies for Life Through Literature, Volume 2. Palo Alto, CA: Addison Wesley.

Block, C. C. , & Mangieri, J. N. (1996b). Reason to Read: Thinking Strategies for Life Through Literature, Volume 3. Palo Alto, CA: Addison Wesley.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Erickson, F. (L986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on reaching (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan

Hodder, I. (L994). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 393-402). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage..

Hoffman, J. V.; McCarthey, S. J.; Elliott, B; Price, D.; Bayles, D.; Ferree, A.; Rehders, S.; & Abbott, J. Literature-based reading instruction: Problems, possiblities, and polemics in the struggle to change. In Leu, D. & Kinzer, C. Literacies for the 21st century: Research and Practice. Forty-fifth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference, pp. 359-372.

Kauffman, G.; Short, K. G.; Crawford, K. M., Kahn, L.; & Kaser, S. (L996). Examine the roles of teachers and students in literature circles across classroom contexts. In Leu, D. & Kinzer, C. Literacies for the 21st century: Research and Practice. Forty-fifth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference, pp. 373-384.

Marshall, S. P. & Hatcher, C. (1996). Promoting Career Development Through CADRE.

Educational Leadership,53, 42-46.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Scharer, P. L. (L996). "Are We Supposed to Be Asking Questions?": Moving from Teacher-Directed to Student-Directed Book Discussions. In Leu, J. D. And Kinzer, C. K. (Eds.). Literacies in the Twenty-first Century: Research and Practice; Forty-fifth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference, 420-429.

Vygotsky, L. S. (L978). Mind in society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watson, K., & Young, B. (L986). Discourse for learning in the classroom. Language Arts, 63 126-133.

Wollman-Bonilla, J. E. (1989). Reading journals: Invitation to participate. Reading Teacher, 43, 112-120.

Table 1-1

Average Student Achievement Gains by Teachers and Grade-Level

Teacher	Grade Level of Student Point Gains Grade 3	TAAS Gains* Grade 4	TAAS Gains Grade 5
1	53*	11	11
2	56	2	10
3	42	23	6
4	46	8	17
5	44	18	5
6	NA	11	12
7	33	13	5
8	43	9	**-4**
9	59	**-6**	9

*Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

Table 1-2

Correlates of Teacher Change Supports With At-risk Students' Growth in Literacy

Change Support	Teachers Ranked According to Amount of Student Growth								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Volunteered to be observed after 4 months & # of strategic behaviors observed	18	13	Did not volun-teer	1	5	Did not volun-teer	3	Did not volun-teer	Did not volun-teer
Mean Oral Contributions during training meetings	1	4	10	8	1	7	9	1	Usually absent
Instructional Quality Posttest	16	13	ancelled observing	3	6	5	2	4	Not in study any longer
Actions that reduce students' Self-initiated use of Strategies	0	0	"	3	1	1	5	4	"
Teacher rank on essay; ability to write their philosophy	3rd	2nd	lst	8th	4th	5th	7th	6th	Absent on day of writing
Number of strategic teaching behaviors on posttest	32	31	"	20	19	18	5	3	"

Table 1-3

Distinguishing Characteristics of Strategic Teaching in the Highest Student Achievement Groups

Stated names of strategies more frequently
Rewarded students for self-initiating the name/use of a strategy
Reviewed strategies name and appropriate uses within and at the end of the lesson, e.g. Which strategy did you use? How did you use it? Describe to me how you used it.
Required all students to contribute at least one example of strategy use during direct instruction
Opened lessons with an example of the strategies' use in students' life
Encouraged self-initiated connections to previous strategies taught
Made connections to previous strategies taught
Talked about more than one strategy during each lesson
Posted strategy sheets in their rooms
Had high expectations that everyone could learn the strategies and allowed ample wait time--did not allow any aspect of the reading to escape them as unimportant and demanded that every student have correctness in their responses and meet all classroom rules
Spent more time during direct instructional time having students read silently and orally and less time reading to them and talking about subjects and words that students will find in the story itself
Asked students to give examples of strategy's use outside of the lesson at hand, e.g. "How can you use this strategy at home?" "How will you know when you have learned to use this strategy?"

Appendix A

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO TRY?

Teacher 3	student selection of materials - motivation
1	Junior Great Books Friday-activities: writing answer, page # Charts can start
4	Informational reading - reread - modeling - track - purpose - slow - talk talk - words - what is important - how group big ideas - summarize paragraphs - Cathy's lesson - author mention more than once graphic - Reading is seeing - drawing - chart - graphic - Dictionary skill - experiments - admit confusions
2	charts - working KWL independently - stories - support in beginning - extra TAAS - Ladies - back - to reflect on
5	- kids talk - "wanted to talk" chart helps - choose books - lots of reading - motivate read - writing time - sharing on Friday - writing - illustrating - help reading "BIG" books - Cunningham Phonics - scribe for week - computer
6	- Carbo - Reading styles - inventory - tape book - fluency
7	- Schedule
8	Music rhymes

Appendix C

Name_____ August 8, 1996 Beginning of Second Year in Program
Please feel free to write as much as you desire to answer each question.
Answer on notebook paper and attach this sheet to the front of your answers.

1. Define good reading instruction
2. If you had to teach a reading lesson to your students tomorrow, what would you teach.
3. What are the factors that most determine students success in reading?
4. How do you know what strategies to teach to your students?
5. What did it take during our first year of working together for you to learn how to teach these strategies to your students?
6. What all convinced you that your instructional approach is the best for your students?
7. What helped you make a transition from more tradition methods of teaching students who are functioning in the lower spectrum of the literacy continuum to your present methods of teaching them?
8. If Dr. Block observed your teaching last year, what did she, you, Dr. Gasser, or your students do that made you want her to come? If Dr. Block did not observe your teaching, what was the most important reasons that you preferred that she visit at a later time? In answering this question you can help Dr. Block to make this year's observations more valuable.
9. What part(s) of the training you received last year best enabled you to become a better teacher and why were these part(s) so valuable to your development?
10. What can we do this year to improve your teaching abilities?
11. What were the most important things your learned that helped you to teach reading in ways that were different from the ways you learned to read?
12. If a parent asked what you do to increase his or her child's reading ability, what would your answer be?
13. What support most increased your ability to help your students use reading strategies independently?
14. Have you done anything to assist other teachers in your building to become better reading teachers? ____yes ____no If so, what did you do and why and was there anything you learned in this training program that helped you reach your colleagues. If you did not assist other teachers in your building, why did you choose not to do so and do you want to do so this year, why or why not? What can we do in the coming year to assist you to work with other teachings in your building if you desire to do so?
15. Describe how a typical reading lesson you teach has changed since you entered this training program and why these changes were important to you.
16. If you could improve the reading lessons you teach, what would you like to do to change them and why.
17. What would you still like to learn to become a better reading teacher?
18. What was your biggest success last year and why was this the most important to you?
19. What should we include in this year's training program for the new teachers coming on board that would make it easier for them to enter the program than it was for you?
20. What else would you like to tell us about the work we are doing together and the training you are receiving?

THE EFFECTIVE USE OF ACTIVE LEARNING STRATEGIES IN CHALLENGING ALL LEARNERS TO THINK

by
Anne Simmons
Reading Support Teacher, Grand Prairie, TX, I.S.D.

In January, 1996, through the adept guidance of Grand Prairie I.S.D. Reading Facilitator, Dr. Judy Gasser and a Texas Christian University professor, Dr. Cathy Block, an enthusiastic group of nine educators left the regular classroom and embarked upon the journey of beginning the Reading Support program in selected Grand Prairie schools. Going against all research, this group carefully developed guidelines for a "pull-out" program to serve third, fourth, and fifth graders who were experiencing reading difficulties in the regular classroom.

Criteria for qualifying for Reading Support was as follows: third graders who scored between ten and thirty percent of the I.T.B.S.; fourth graders with a TLI (Texas Learning Index) on TAAS between sixty-five and thirty-five; and fifth graders with a TLI or TAAS between sixty-five and forty-five. Some Content Mastery students were included in the program--and several who did not qualify for Content Mastery were also included. The intent was to help below-level readers who so often "fall-between-the-cracks". Learning Intervention Packets were completed by the classroom teachers of the students, and Intervention meetings were held before a decision was made to serve students in Reading Support.

Dr. Cathy Block worked with Dr. Gasser and the Reading Support teachers during training sessions to help incorporate different reading strategies into the Reading Support lessons. Dr. Block and Dr. John Mangieri, the authors of Reason to Read (Volumes I,II, and III), trained the teachers in the use of reading strategies, and also visited several classrooms, and "modeled" lessons which utilized her strategies as the rest of the group observed. Both Dr. Block and Dr. Gasser made individual classroom visits when invited.

The principal goal of education is to create (people) who are capable of doing new things, not simply of repeating what other generations have done-(people) who are creative, inventive discoverers. The second goal of education is to form minds which can be critical, can verify, and not accept everything they are offered.

—Jean Piaget

Reason to Read, a program designed to strengthen students' decoding, comprehension, metacognition, and thinking competencies, proved to be a powerful tool in challenging our below-level readers to become more fluent readers. Students were taught to self-initiate many different strategies that enhance decision making. "Thinking Guides", "Think-Alouds", and teacher modeling became highly successful instructional devices in Reading Support. One of the many special features of Reason to Read is its inclusion of twenty-two different types of performance-based assessments for whole-class and individual student evaluation.

The beauty of Reading Support was in seeing not only reading progress, but also in seeing the increase of self-esteem in these students. The balanced literacy program was designed to be used for small groups of six to eight. Students *are not* "pulled-out" of class during their Reading time so they actually receive a "double-shot" of reading instruction each day.

The success of Reading Support in Grand Prairie was shown by improved Reading grades, increased self-esteem of the students, and improvement in most TAAS Reading scores. TAAS

was not taught as part of Reading Support, but the thinking strategies gained by students through Reading Support definitely affected TAAS scores. Another major contributor to the success of the Reading Support program was the enthusiastic approval of both principals and classroom teachers.

In addition to Reason to Read, Rigby materials were used in Reading Support classrooms. Through Rigby, students were successfully reading high-interest materials which were below-their-frustration-level. The combination of Reason to Read with Rigby instruction allowed below-level readers to learn new strategies to assist them in improving: thinking skills, oral reading fluency, prediction skills, SSR (sustained silent reading), and comprehension.

A brief explanation of a typical Reading Support Lesson follows: (As teachers, we all have our own teaching styles just as our students have their own leaning styles. This is only one interpretation of a possible lesson). *Day 1)* -Distribute books. Discuss the cover, title page, author, etc.. Guided "picture-walk" up to the last page, Guided Reading with discussion , and Response to reading. *Day 2)* -Reread individually or "partner read", questioning, and finish Response to reading. *Day 3)* -Silent Reading of the selection or begin a new book depending on the needs of the group (see day 1). *Day 4)* -See Day 2. *Day 5)* -"Individual" Running Records (miscue analysis) or informal testing..... Others will work in Learning Centers: Listening, Research, Writing, or Computer until it is their turn for assessment.

As we begin the first full-year of Reading Support, it will be interesting to follow the successes of the program through the course of an entire year as compared to a one-semester program. Hopefully, gains in students' reading progress will show an even higher increase than before. What is so exciting is that ten more Reading Support teachers have been hired in our district!! This year, elementary school students (3rd, 4th, and 5th) who are experiencing reading difficulties will be served at ALL campuses!

Entry requirements for Reading Support have changed slightly. The ITBS short battery achievement test was not administered to second grade students last year so an assessment is planned for this years' third graders before they will be considered for the program. Fourth and fifth grade students who have a TLI (Texas Learning Index) on TAAS between sixty-nine and forty meet district guidelines for Reading Support and will be placed in the program. Content Mastery students will enter based on TAAS TLI (Practice test) scores.

A new, and exciting dimension to the Reading program is the addition of seven Academic Development teachers who will work closely with Content Mastery teachers and Reading Support teachers. (In identified buildings) The Academic Development teachers will work with second and third grade students (after achievement tests are administered) and fourth and fifth graders who have TLI scores *below* forty.

In conclusion, it has been my pleasure to work with Dr. Judy Gasser, Dr. Cathy Block, Dr. John Mangieri, and the other eight Reading Support teachers who were willing to be "risk-takers" in beginning a successful, balanced literacy program in the Grand Prairie I.S.D. As we continue to embark on our ever-improving journey, we are once again joined by administrators and classroom teachers; and this year the addition of the Academic Development teachers will make the Reading program in our district even stronger. Our goal is the effective implementation of staff "teamwork" (Classroom teachers, Reading Support teachers, Academic Development teachers, Content Mastery teachers, Facilitators, Administrators, and University professors) to help significantly improve the reading skills of below-level readers and at the same time, build their self-esteem.

Proposed Reading Support Schedule 1996 - 1997

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
	Centers	Centers	Centers	
Word-Making Days and Word Wall	Intro to New Strategy Descriptive Narrative Asking Questions Comparing/Contrasting Interpreting New Information Summarizing to Member More Drawing Conclusions Drawing Inferences Compare & Contrast Recognizing Patterns Points of View Cause-and-Effect Suspending Judgments Reasoning to Improve Comp. Using Foresight How - To's Eliminating Propaganda Fact, Opinion, and Judgment Making Decisions-Weighted Making Decisions Using Grids Judging the Credit of Sources Evaluating Decisions Persuasive Problem Solving Process Solving Small Problems Reasoning "Backward" Analyzing Success & Failure Listing to Solve Problems Analogies to Solve Problems Personal Narrative Recognizing Strengths & Weaknesses Monitoring Understanding Metacomprehension Improve Creativity-1st Ideas Identifying Personal Strengths Metacognition - Improve Perform Becoming More Inventive Expository Creating Mental Images Brainstorming for Creativity Creating Original Ideas Eliminating Blocks to Creativity Becoming More Inventive Reciprocity for Group Productivity	Work with new strategy. Read new book.	Read new book. Group Retrospect with tape. Choose Satellite book with me for take home.	Book Talks Making Books Charts

REFLECTION ON RESEARCH-BASED PRACTICES
JANUARY 1997

Please rate from infrequently (1) to frequently (6) the opportunities you have had to implement the following research-based reading practices in your Reading Support classroom:

1. Sustained reading/writing of high quality materials is critical.

1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Comprehension instruction is not just questions and answers. Children must be taught appropriate strategies to comprehend text.

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Acceleration is possible when teachers teach at the right point. Ongoing assessment informs us what students need next.

1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Comprehension strategies and thinking processes must be modeled using methods such as think aloudes and teacher talks.

1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Every instructional moment must be used to expand, personalize, and intensify instruction.

1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Instruction must be at the student's instructional level which can be measure by running records and careful teacher observations.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Rereading of familiar texts helps build fluency for struggling readers.

1 2 3 4 5 6

8. Responsive teaching and instructional conversations are often needed one on one.

1 2 3 4 5 6

9. Some expert teachers can "back off" and listen to students and provide an equal amount of student talk compared to teacher talk.

1 2 3 4 5 6

10. Competent and fluent readers use cross checking while reading and develop self-improving systems which teachers can observe.

1 2 3 4 5 6

11. Transfer of reading strategies to new reading situations is essential and must be taught and then observed.

1 2 3 4 5 6

12. Writing is an important component of a reading program.

1 2 3 4 5 6

13. The intervention being provided is congruent and similar to the student's classroom instruction.

1 2 3 4 5 6

14. Teachers must make sure that they are not so busy teaching that they are interfering with student learning.

1 2 3 4 5 6